

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 359

SP 012 403

AUTHOR Clegg, Ambrose A.; And Others
 TITLE Teacher Effectiveness and School Organization Variables.
 PUB DATE Mar 78
 NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.82 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Decision Making Skills; *Effective Teaching; *Organizational Theories; *Predictor Variables; *School Environment; *Teacher Interns
 IDENTIFIERS Conventional Schools; Magnet Schools; Title I Schools

ABSTRACT

In an effort to enlarge the focus on teacher effectiveness to include environmental factors outside the classroom, this report investigated (1) the relationship between supervisors' ratings of teacher effectiveness and the ability of teacher interns to make instructional decisions conforming to the school's value and organizational structures and (2) characteristics differentiating teacher interns who can and cannot make such decisions. Data were collected on fifteen teacher interns in three organizationally differing schools through interviews, intern rankings, and three instruments designed to describe intern experience and establish meanings, patterns, and concepts for understanding intern adaptability in the school setting. Data interpretations are offered relating teacher effectiveness to the three organizational settings: traditional, magnet school, and Title I school. (MJB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED151359

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Teacher Effectiveness and School Organization Variables

Ambrose A. Clegg and Leo W. Anglin

Kent State University

Ethel D. Migra

Warren City Schools, Ohio

American Educational Research Association
Toronto
March, 1978

(Printed in the U.S.A.)

SP012 H03

Does School Organization Make A Difference in Preparing Teachers?

There seems to be an underlying assumption in teacher education programs that a beginning teacher who is effective in one school setting will be equally effective in almost any other school setting. In actual practice, however, such does not appear to be the case. In a recently completed study the authors investigated the relationship between teacher effectiveness and (1) the ability to identify value and organizational patterns in the school, and (2) the ability to make appropriate curriculum and instructional decisions in different school organizational settings. The theoretical framework for this approach grew largely out of recent research on schools as social institutions and the study of school organizational structures.

This article is based upon a research study supported in part by a grant from the State of Ohio Department of Public Instruction, Project 419, Redesign of Teacher Education. Full details are presented in Teacher Effectiveness and School Organization Variables: A Technical Report by L. Anglin, A. Clegg, P. Weigand, E. Migra, and A. Hammons, Department of Elementary Education, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242, July, 1977 (130 pp.). The points of view or opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Ohio State Department of Public Instruction.

Teacher Effectiveness - State of the Art

Much effort has been expended during the past fifty years to determine the personality characteristics and performance competencies of effective teachers. Unfortunately, most of these studies have had only limited value in predicting teacher effectiveness (Barr, 1950, 1961; Getzels and Jackson, 1963). A major criticism of such studies involves their tendency to treat teachers as isolated entities with little attention given to environmental factors such as the organizational structure of the school, relationships with peer teachers, and community demands, all of which influence the teacher's effectiveness with pupils (Perrow, 1969, 1970; Romberg, 1974; Anglin, 1975; Migra, 1976). There is little empirical data, however, to indicate how the ability to perform effectively with students is affected by these environmental factors.

Research in the fields of sociology and anthropology suggests that variables related to school organization may be more important in the study of teacher effectiveness than the personality traits and performance competencies studies that have been emphasized to date. Some of these variables include: (1) socialization, (2) the locus of power and authority, (3) the role and influence of significant others on teachers, and (4) the opportunity to make effective decisions related to one's role as a teacher in a particular school environment (Getzels and Jackson, 1963; Bidwell, 1965; Edgar and Warren, 1969; Lortie, 1973, 1975).

Objectives of the Study

Two major questions provided the direction for this investigation:

1. Is teacher effectiveness, as measured by the rating of a principal or supervisor, related to the teacher intern's ability to make instructional decisions which conform to the value and organizational structure of the school?

2. Which teacher characteristics can be used to differentiate between teacher interns who can make instructional decisions that conform or adapt to several different value and organizational structures of schools and those who cannot?

The Conduct of the Study

Population. The population of this study consisted of fifteen university interns who were enrolled in a pilot teacher education project in an industrial city of Northeastern Ohio with a population of 65,000. The interns, 12 female and 3 male, were elementary education majors who were completing basic requirements for certification. During a twenty-week period each intern participated in three different classroom assignments in at least two different elementary school buildings, completing 14 quarter hours of education courses as well as their student teaching assignments. In addition to the interns, the cooperating teachers and building principals were also included in the population.

Participating Schools. The three participating schools represented contrasting organizational structures as well as student populations. One school was organized in a traditional manner with self-contained classrooms and served as a middle income residential neighborhood near the outer edge of the city. Another school was a Title I school which served a predominantly lower middle income black population. The organization of this school also centered around self-contained classrooms, but many additional services were available to the teachers such as individualized reading and math centers, special reading teachers, and a mainstreaming program. The third school, which was quite different from the others, was a magnet school in which children from predominantly white elementary schools worked with

children from predominantly black elementary schools in a racially balanced school situation. The school was located in the center of the city and both white and black children were bussed to it from their home schools. Teachers in the magnet schools were organized into teaching teams and individualized instruction was the primary teaching mode.

Data Collection. A modified ethnographic methodology was employed in the present study. Data was gathered by a trained observer, interview procedures, intern rankings, and three survey instruments which were used to (1) describe the interns' experiences in different types of school organizations, and (2) establish meanings, patterns, and concepts for understanding the adaptability of teachers in the school setting. This data was analyzed using techniques reported by Anglin, Romberg, and Fox (1976) and Migra (1976).

Interviews. Interns, cooperating teachers, and building principals were interviewed during the study to determine the type of instructional decision making which they perceived to be taking place in the classrooms. Interns were interviewed three times, once during each of the three instructional periods in the different school settings to determine whether their perceptions of the decision-making role varied from one organizational setting to another. An identical interview was conducted once with each cooperating teacher and building principal.

In conjunction with the interviews each subject completed a "Teacher Education Interview Form" in which a Likert-type scale was used to denote the "real" or observed decision-making role of the teacher in the classroom. Subjects were also asked to use a second scale to identify the teacher's decision-making role in an ideal situation. The interviews and the accompanying surveys were used to determine the decision-making patterns

which existed in the classrooms and the differences which existed between the real role of the teacher and the ideal role as perceived by interns, teachers, and principals.

Intern Ranking. Each building principal was asked to participate in a ranking of the interns by a card sort method during the fifteenth week of the experience. They were asked to select the top three interns who they believed would successfully fit into their school programs as first year teachers and the three interns they believed would not fit. The result of the card sort was used to determine the high (very successful) and low (less successful) interns for each school building.

Observations. One of the principal investigators served as an external, nonparticipant observer, and made two types of observations. A Formal Observation Procedure was used to record the activities and events which the teacher interns encountered as they moved from one school setting to another. This information included the types of activities the interns undertook, their successes and their failures, and the emotional tone of the interns concerning their experiences. An Informal Observation Report was also used to record the general characteristics of value and organizational patterns of the schools in which the interns were placed. This included a description of the community served by the schools, as well as the roles of the principal and teachers in the schools.

Findings

Teacher Effectiveness and Organizational Variables. The data collected in this study indicated that interns who were rated high by a principal displayed characteristics related to the school organizational pattern that differed substantially from those who were rated low. Among the

interns classified as highly effective, four were rated high in two schools. Among the low interns one was rated low in all three and another was rated low in two schools. In one case an intern was classified by the principal of the traditional school as a noneffective intern but was classified as very effective by the principal of the Title I school. Table 1 illustrates the principal ranking of the interns as most effective (high), and least effective (low).

Insert Table 1 about here

A comparison of roles of the high and low interns was conducted using data collected by interviews and surveys as the interns rotated through the three different schools. The interviews and surveys were designed to address perceived differences between real and ideal teacher decision-making roles on 11 variables related to school organization and value patterns (Anglin, 1975; DeVault, 1975). These variables were:

Long term decisions	Short term decisions
Whole class decisions	Small group decisions
Individual decisions	Interactive decisions
Preactive decisions	Joint (teacher and principal)
Teacher made decisions	Decisions
Administrative decisions	Total instructional decisions

Comparisons were made for each of the 11 variables between high and low interns and the cooperating teachers in all three schools using a one-way analysis of variance technique. A Scheffé test was conducted on each significant F score. A summary of these findings is presented in Table 2. Taken as a whole these data represent important differences between schools. In the traditional school no significant differences were found between high or low interns or among teachers in that school. In contrast, there were significant differences found in the Title I school and in the magnet school. High and low interns differed from cooperating teachers. These data suggest that all of the interns in the study would fit into the decision-making role

of the traditional school and would be able to function reasonably well. But the same is not true for the intern's ability to function in alternative school organizations such as the Title I school or the magnet school. It appears that in these latter schools, decision-making is more complex and the bases for decisions are not readily evident to the interns on such variables as long-term, whole class, preactive, teacher-made and administrative decision-making roles.

Insert Table 2 about here

Perceptions of Real and Ideal. The Teacher Education Interview Form revealed additional data on interns' and teachers' perceptions of real and ideal decision-making roles as they related to the 11 variables. Difference scores were computed between the real (or observed) decision-making patterns in the classroom and the subject's perception of the ideal decision pattern. Teachers' scores showed very little discrepancy between real and ideal situations. This can be interpreted to mean that the teachers felt very comfortable with their classroom organizations. Interns, on the other hand, indicated a greater discrepancy between the real and ideal situations.

A t test was used to compare the difference scores for high and low interns in each of the three schools. As shown in Table 3, these differences were significant ($p < .05$) at the Title I and magnet schools.

Insert Table 3 about here

The data from these t tests indicated that high interns had a significantly smaller mean difference score than low interns in each of the alternative school organization settings. In other words, the high interns saw the classroom teacher as a positive model which they wanted to emulate, while

the low ranked interns perceived the classroom teacher as being less than ideal.

In summary, the data presented in Tables 2 and 3 suggest the following:

(1) there are distinguishing characteristics between traditional and alternative school organizations related to instructional decision-making and (2) interns rated as high or low by principals can be distinguished by differences in their perceptions of real and ideal instructional decision-making roles of teachers. Furthermore, observational data of the intern's classroom performance in the alternative schools indicated that low interns tended to make most instructional decisions before or after school (preactive) and did not modify them during the course of the day. Finally, those interns who were ranked low in Title I and magnet schools taught large group lessons while those interns who ranked high used a variety of grouping practices including individualized instruction which was more characteristic of the model of instruction in those schools.

Organizational Characteristics and the Effective Teacher

As noted earlier, each of the schools represented different organizational characteristics. The findings of this study suggest that although the characteristics are common to each of the schools, the degree to which each was emphasized differed depending upon the type of school. These characteristics and the varying degree of emphasis are shown in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

For example, the teacher in the traditional school was expected to be a master teacher in large group instructional activities and to implement the school district curriculum with little alteration or modification. Peer interaction was also a high priority for acceptance in the traditional school. This interaction was not necessarily related to the instructional activities

of the school but did require that the intern be friendly and a contributor in coffee room discussions. In the traditional school, dress and appearance were also a major prerequisite for social acceptance by the staff. Interns who did not dress "professionally" (ties for men and dresses or pant suits for women) were considered to be individuals who really were not interested in being teachers. Of all the characteristics used to evaluate the success of the intern in the traditional school, the most important was the quality of rapport that the individual had with the student population. Closely related to this characteristic was the intern's ability to maintain classroom discipline and respect.

A successful teacher in the alternative school organizations, the Title I school and the magnet school, represented quite a different instructional model. The two characteristics which appeared to predominate are: tolerance for ambiguity and change, and the teacher as curriculum maker. In contrast to the traditional school where the instructional schedule was set in the fall and maintained throughout the year, the teachers in the alternative schools were constantly revising their instructional schedules in order to accommodate special projects. This caused frequent disruptions in the instructional day. In order to function effectively in such settings, teachers needed to have confidence in their ability to accept frequent change without becoming frustrated and upset. Teachers in alternative school organizations also needed to show an understanding of the community which the school served. This understanding was demonstrated in many ways such as living in the community, making home visits, or by being active in school community projects. Failure to become involved in the community was recorded as a negative comment in the intern's evaluation. Although large-group instruction was used to some

extent in both of the alternative school organizations, it was expected that teachers in these schools would also use a variety of strategies such as small-group and individualized instruction. In the magnet school it was expected that the teacher would assume autonomy in the role of curriculum maker. That is, the teacher should be able both to modify and adapt school curriculum to fit the needs of individuals and to select appropriate instructional materials. This is quite different from the traditional school in which the teacher was expected to make little, if any, change. The teachers in the Title I school were expected to assume only a modest role in curriculum development. As in the traditional school, we found that the major prerequisite for success in the Title I school was the teacher's ability to establish positive rapport with their students.

To summarize, it was apparent that the successful teacher in any school situation needed to be a warm, likeable individual who could develop a positive classroom atmosphere and good student rapport. Successful teachers, however, must also be able to adapt their instructional roles to fit into the organization of the school in which they are teaching. In the traditional school this required them to be effective in large group instruction and competent in implementing school district and building policies. In the alternative schools the teacher's role was more complex. It was expected that the teacher would become involved in curriculum development and would adjust the school district goals to meet the individual needs of the students. In moving from one school organizational setting to another it was necessary for interns to modify their roles substantially in order to be effective.

Discussion

This study clearly suggests that not everybody is well suited to all types of schools, especially ones that may be highly innovative or emphasize individualized instruction. This finding seems to contradict a basic assumption under which many teacher education programs function; namely, that an effective teacher will fit equally well into all instructional situations. This clearly was not the case with the interns that were included in this study. One major conclusion is that it is imperative that preservice teachers have experiences in various types of schools prior to certification. These experiences will help the interns determine in which type of school organization they can be most successful and which may be difficult for them.

Another consideration is that teacher educators should take a critical look at their preservice programs and determine to what extent the students are taught the subtle differences among schools. Novice teachers are expected to discover and adjust to the organizational goals on their own. Those teachers who are perceptive seem to discover these goals readily but teachers who are not perceptive can make critical mistakes that will lessen their chances of being successful. It is our belief that the organizational differences among the expected roles of teachers in different types of schooling situations can and should be taught. They should be made an integral part of the preservice curriculum as well as part of the field participation experience. The complex realities of schools no longer allow teacher educators the luxury of providing students with only one experience in a single classroom. It is imperative that the preservice experiences of teachers be designed to include a variety of organizational settings

and that the undergraduate curriculum enable prospective teachers to recognize different decision-making patterns and adjust their instructional procedures accordingly.

REFERENCES

- Anglin, L. W. The school organizations and curriculum-instruction decision-making. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1975).
- Anglin, L., Romberg, T., and G. Fox. CMTI impact study design and survey analysis: Technical report no. 6. Madison, Wisconsin: Corps Member Training Institute Evaluation Study, 1976.
- Barr, A. S. Teaching competencies. In W.S. Monroe (ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research, rev. ed. New York: Macmillan Co., 1950, 1446-54.
- Barr, A. S. and others. Wisconsin studies of the measurement and prediction of teacher effectiveness: A summary of investigations. Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Publications, 1961.
- DeVault, M. V. Descriptor for individualized instruction: Development procedures and results. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, September, 1975.
- Edgar, D. E. and R. L. Warren. Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 42(4), 386-399.
- Getzels, J. W. and P. W. Jackson. The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, 506-582.
- Lortie, D. C. Observations on teaching as work. In R.M.W. Travers (ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, 474-497.
- Lortie, D. C. School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Migra, E. The transition from theory into practice: A microethnography of student teaching as a cultural experience. (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, 1976).
- Perrow, C. A framework for the comparative analysis of organization. American Sociological Review, 1969, 14, 194-208.
- Perrow, C. Organizational analysis: A sociological view. Belmont, California: Brooks Cole, 1970.
- Romberg, T. A. The diagnostic process in mathematics instruction. Paper presented at the National Conference on Remedial Mathematics, Kent State University, May, 1974.

Table 1
Interns Rated High and Low by Principals

<u>Intern Number</u>	<u>Magnet School</u>	<u>Title I School</u>	<u>Traditional School</u>
01	High	High	
03	High		High
04	Low	Low	Low
05			High
07	Low	Low	
09		High	Low
11		High	High
14	High	High	
15			Low

Table 2
 Summary of Sheffé tests for Differences
 Between Mean Scores on 11 Variables
 Related to Instructional Decision-Making

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Significant Differences Between Interns and Teachers</u>		
	<u>Traditional</u>	<u>Title I</u>	<u>Magnet</u>
1. Long term decisions		H**	H**L**
2. Short term decisions			
3. Whole class decisions			H*L**
4. Small group decisions			
5. Individual decisions			
6. Preactive decisions		H**	H*L**
7. Interactive decisions			L*
8. Teacher-made decisions		H**L*	
9. Join decisions (teacher/ principal)			
10. Administrative decisions			H**L**
11. Total decisions		H**L*	

Key: H = High Rated Interns
 L = Low Rated Interns

* $p < .05$
 ** $p < .01$

Table 3
Comparison of Difference Scores
Between High and Low Interns
on Real-Ideal Survey

<u>School</u>	<u>t Value</u>	<u>Df</u>	<u>p</u>
Magnet	3.31	3	$p < .05$
Title I	3.16	3	$p < .05$
Traditional	2.01	3	

Table 4
School Organizational Characteristics and Degree of Emphasis
Needed by Teachers

<u>Organizational Characteristics</u>	<u>Magnet</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Traditional</u>
1. Recognition of neighborhood characteristics	3	3	1
2. Classroom management/organization	3	3	1
3. Classroom discipline	2	3	2
4. Individualization of district/school curriculum goals	3	2	1
5. Cooperative planning with special teachers	3	2	1
6. Whole/large group instruction	2	3	3
7. Small group/individualized instruction	3	2	1
8. Tolerance for ambiguity and change	3	3	1
9. Interactive (short-term) decision-making	3	2	1
10. Teacher as curriculum maker	3	1	1
11. Teacher-principal joint decision making	2	1	1
12. Team membership	3	1	1
13. Implementation of school district curriculum goals with little variation	1	2	3
14. Acceptance of administrative decisions	2	2	3
15. Peer social interaction	2	1	3
16. Peer professional interactions	3	1	1
17. Professional image	2	2	3
18. Rapport with student population	3	3	3

Key: 3 = high emphasis needed
2 = moderate emphasis needed
1 = low emphasis needed